DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 001 CS 214 182

AUTHOR Fox, Dana L.
TITLE What Is Literature? Two Preservice Teachers' Conceptions of Literature and of the Teaching of Literature.
PUB DATE Dec 93
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (43rd, Charleston, SC, December 1-4, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Course Content; Educational Research; *English Instruction; *English Teacher Education; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; *Literature; Methods Courses; Secondary Education; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *English Teachers; Preservice Teachers; Response to Literature

ABSTRACT

A case study examined two preservice teachers' attitudes about literature and the teaching of literature, and examined whether a "Teaching of Literature" course for secondary English education majors influenced their attitudes. Data included in-depth, semi-structured interviews, participant observation, written artifacts (learning logs, portfolios, etc.) and the researcher's ongoing, reflective log. One subject enrolled in the program after a short career as a business executive in a major computing firm. He began the course wanting to learn "techniques" for teaching literature in secondary English classrooms and was uncomfortable with the response-centered literature curriculum presented in the course. Throughout the course, he persistently questioned the purposes of literature for what he called "non-English majors." Neither his conceptions of literature nor his attitudes towards students changed as a result of his experiences in the course. Unlike the first subject, the second subject (a member of a minority group) willingly struggled in the course to make sense of his previous encounters with literature and gradually began to view literature and the teaching of literature in new and powerful ways. The course offered the second subject a chance to develop his own voice as a future teacher. Findings suggest that teacher educators: (1) must become models of the kind of teaching they encourage; (2) should provide opportunities for prospective teachers to identify and examine their beliefs; and (3) should realize that their good intentions do not guarantee results. (Contains 38 references.)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 001

What Is Literature?
Two Preservice Teachers' Conceptions of Literature and of the Teaching of Literature

Dana L. Fox
University of Arizona

Office Address:
Education 515
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

(602) 621-1488 or 621-1311
FAX Number: (602) 621-8407
Ethernet Address: dfox@mail.ed.arizona.edu

A paper presented at the 43rd Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference in a Symposium on "Teacher Beliefs and Conceptual Change in the Teaching of Literature in Middle and Secondary Schools," Charleston, South Carolina, December 1-4, 1993.

This research was funded by the University of Arizona Foundation and the Office of Vice President for Research at the University of Arizona. Project title: *Constructing a Case Literature for Teacher Education: Exploring and Enhancing Teacher Knowledge in Secondary English.*

CS214152

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Fox
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What Is Literature?
Two Preservice Teachers' Conceptions of Literature
and of the Teaching of Literature

Critics of teacher education programs point to the gap between the situated complexity of life in classrooms and the decontextualized, formal principles which are often transmitted through university curricula. In the past, teacher knowledge has regularly been described in terms of specific skills or predictable routines, and teacher educators believed that such static knowledge could be delivered to novices in preservice coursework and applied later in classrooms. Largely, the nature and relevance of *teacher beliefs* was ignored by teacher educators and researchers. Recently, however, researchers have increasingly attended to the complexities of teacher knowledge and beliefs (Carter, 1990) and have suggested that effective teachers are those who move beyond simple routines by learning *to reflect*--by learning 1) to articulate and explore their own beliefs about teaching and learning and 2) to examine their own practice critically and to search continually for ways to improve it.

In order to foster such a reflective frame of mind in novices, teacher educators have begun to redesign professional education coursework, inviting prospective teachers to participate in experiences of inquiry which support continual, lifelong, self-regulated learning. We know that individuals' personal beliefs and past histories in school affect both their conceptions of the role of the teacher (Britzman, 1986) and their professional orientations and classroom practices (Grossman, 1990; Nespor, 1987; Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, & Lloyd, 1991; Zancanella, 1991). In addition, teacher educators have begun to acknowledge that prospective teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning are often not "well adapted to teaching" (Calderhead, 1991) and that these beliefs "limit the range of ideas or actions that they are willing and able to consider" (Bird, Anderson, Sullivan, & Swidler,

1993). In an attempt to influence such beliefs, teacher educators have begun to design teacher education coursework which has the potential to enable teachers-to-be to grapple with their beliefs about teaching and learning, to explore their knowledge and conceptions of subject matter, to provide an occasion for transition to pedagogical thinking, and to engender a reflective attitude toward teaching (Grossman, 1991; 1992). In such professional education experiences, teacher candidates have opportunities to become knowledge producers rather than knowledge receivers, moving from what Kutz (1992) calls *unconfident answer-knowers* to *confident question-askers* (p. 69).

The project reported here (drawn from a larger qualitative study [Fox, 1993a]), narrates the development of two preservice teachers who were enrolled in a "Teaching of Literature" course for secondary English education majors. This article describes their beliefs about literature and the teaching of literature and speculates on the influence (or lack of influence) the course had on their beliefs. Here, preservice teachers' beliefs are defined as the "attitudes and values about teaching, students, and the education process that students bring with them to teacher education" (Pajares, 1993, p. 46). The stories of Larry and Mario (pseudonyms) provide examples of both the problems and possibilities teacher educators encounter when they privilege belief exploration and challenge in their courses.

Reconceptualizing the Teaching of Literature: The Teacher Education Course

For the majority of the 24 preservice teachers enrolled in this course, studying literature in the past had meant producing a "right" response to a text, usually the response their teachers had in mind. Their previous experiences in secondary and especially college English classes provided them with a very narrow conception of literature and taught them to see "literature as a specialized body of academic material that is 'covered' in school and afterwards forgotten" (Scholes, 1987, p. 70). The "Teaching of Literature" course (a semester-

long, three-credit-hour course, one of three required methods courses for secondary English majors at a large southwestern university) was intentionally designed to explore, extend, and even transform future secondary teachers beliefs about literature and the teaching of literature.

Inquiry, reflection, collaboration, response-centered learning, and theory-building served as course themes. Throughout the course, teacher candidates were invited to "live through" a response-centered literature curriculum (Rosenblatt, 1978, 1983; Nelms, 1988; Fox, 1991b). A variety of instructional strategies and course assignments encouraged belief inquiry. Each class participant generated questions and goals for the course; wrote an autobiographical "reading history" narrative; and conducted a mini-ethnographic project in one or more local high school English classrooms (Kutz & Roskelly, 1991). Each individual also completed a case study of a high school student as a reader, and read and discussed case studies of beginning teachers of secondary English (Fox, 1991a). Readings included 1) texts which offered specific suggestions for new literature teachers (e.g., Purves et al., 1990); 2) a variety of classic and contemporary novels popular with adolescent readers (Anaya, 1972; Cisneros, 1989; Hurston, 1990; Lee, 1960; Taylor, 1976); and 3) an array of professional articles by classroom teachers. Throughout the course, the preservice teachers wrote multiple responses to literature and to classroom activities, kept learning logs or response journals, and engaged in literature discussion groups. Each participant also wrote four "think pieces" or speculative writings focused on key issues, questions, or topics in the teaching of literature which emerged during class discussions. Finally, all course participants wrote midterm and final self-evaluation statements and compiled a course portfolio. These experiences were carefully designed so that the teacher candidates might begin to take the first steps toward

the construction of their own "personally-situated theories" of teaching and learning in literature classrooms (Kutz, 1992).

Methodology

Specific research questions addressed in this article include 1) What are teacher candidates' attitudes and beliefs about literature and about the teaching of literature prior to their work in the teacher education course and 2) Does the course influence their attitudes and beliefs, and, if so, how? Data-gathering methods included: 1) *in-depth, semi-structured interviews* (Spradley, 1979; Seidman, 1991) with each participant at the beginning of the course and after the course was completed; 2) *participant observation* in each of the fifteen weekly class meetings (about two and one-half hours each); 3) *the collection of written artifacts* (e.g., participants' learning logs and portfolios, written responses to literature or class discussion, "think pieces," mini-ethnographic projects, and midterm and final self-evaluation statements); and a *researcher's on-going, reflective log*. The researcher served as the instructor for the course and was assisted by a graduate student who functioned as a participant observer.

The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. Classroom observations (often audiotaped) were recorded by hand. All of the information concerning each participant was independently "consolidated, reduced, and interpreted" (Merriam, 1988) and brought together in a case study data base or case record (Yin, 1984). Analysis was based on the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Categories which emerged from the initial interviews were continually compared with categories from the observations of the teacher education course and from the written documents. These categories were labeled as empirical assertions (Erickson, 1986) such as, "Larry views literature as a body of work to be analyzed, critiqued, and judged." Once an analysis of each individual case record was

completed, a final case study for each participant was written. An identification of various recurring themes within each case provided a means for cross-case analysis.

Summaries of the Two Case Studies

Larry: Learning Techniques and Recipes for Teaching Literature

> *I have been thoroughly uncomfortable with this class. But I have definitely been engaged. Provoked. Forced into self-questioning and self-defining. I will say that that is a lot to get out of a college class, regardless of whether or not it meets my picture of what a class should be. --Larry, a teacher candidate*

Larry enrolled in the teacher education program as a post-baccalaureate student. After a short career as a business executive in a major computing firm, he decided that he wanted to be an English teacher. He was older than most of his classmates, and while he was enrolled in the course, he taught composition courses part-time at a local community college. He began the course wanting to learn "techniques" for teaching literature in secondary English classrooms:

> I signed up for this course hoping to learn specific techniques that I could take into an English class. Too often, I have had to play teacher-performer, simply because students have stared at me deadpan, unmoved by a story I've assigned. And I've observed other teachers having no better luck, however hard they worked to elicit interest in a story or drama or poem. So my primary goal for this class has been a repertoire of techniques for making students talk about literature and enjoy the process.

Larry constantly pushed for more "techniques" or "recipes for teaching." However, he was uncomfortable with teaching methods which involved small-group discussion or the social negotiation of meaning in literature discussions. Even though he said he did not want to play "teacher-performer," he had trouble envisioning teaching beyond that of "imparting knowledge" or "giving information."

When asked to consider his own ideas about literature or his beliefs about teaching and learning, Larry grew increasingly impatient. Such introspection seemed to be a waste of

time to him, and he often reflected that the course "frustrated" him. For example, he wanted direct answers to his questions about teaching literature, and seemed to feel that there must be "right answers" that could be delivered to him by "experts." He consistently refused, even though he was regularly invited, to observe and reflect upon the "Teaching of Literature" class as an example of an environment for reading and discussing literature which he might create in his own classroom. Learning about the teaching of literature by living through a response-centered curriculum was distasteful for Larry. "I felt put off by my instructor's reluctance to answer my questions when they were asked," he complained, "I began to feel the class was group therapy-based led by a nondirective analyst. Ask a question and my teacher-analyst would inevitably say, 'That's a good question. What do you think?'" In addition, Larry was quite troubled by the fact that he was asked to set his own goals for this course and asked to participate regularly in the process of self-evaluation. "I don't have a clue what my grade will be," Larry wrote in his ninth log entry, "except for what I read into comments on my papers. . . . Are you aware that your grading method produces anxiety? Do you think that is constructive?"

Larry's responses to literature in the course also centered on technique. For example, when he responded to a poem early in the course, he pointed to the poet's craft:

> The title tells too much. Otherwise I like the first stanza on first reading and the second on the third reading. Good use of simile and metaphor--both colloquial--flirts with cliche--& original. The verb choice was unexciting, so I have to study this thing closer to figure out what gives the language freshness.

Both his written response and his participation in class discussion reveal that for Larry, literature is a body of work to be analyzed, critiqued, and judged. Literature is somewhat obscure, he feels, and must be "studied" again and again in order to be understood. Following a small-group and whole-class discussion of the poem, Larry reflected, "I felt my response [to the poem] was not shared. . . . I felt tougher than most in my judgments." This

"tougher than most" attitude persisted throughout the course as Larry continually described the literature selections as somehow "less than" what he termed "quality" literature.

Larry's negative attitudes toward some learners became readily apparent in his written reflections and his contributions to class discussions. In fact, his negative comments about certain students offended his classmates in the teacher education course. In one of his early "think pieces," Larry described his observations of students in two classes at a local high school: a gifted and talented creative writing class and a lower-tracked English class. Larry was clearly impressed with the GAT class ("for students who were motivated") and the instructor's lecture about classical Greek sculpture. To Larry, the GAT class seemed well-organized and the information logically delivered. In contrast, he was appalled at what he called the "student zombies" in the lower-tracked class: "It's not that these students were violent, disruptive, or even resisting. They were simply illiterate in English. Two were from Mexico. Three spoke English marginally well." Larry reported that he empathized with the lower-track instructor: "I was enormously impressed by his patience and his efforts to convey the beauty of books to faces who hardly comprehended 'beauty,' 'books.'" When I asked him if he really believed that these students were unable to comprehend beauty (*Whose* beauty? *Whose* books?), Larry failed to reply. Throughout the semester, he maintained his attitude that the students in the lower-tracked class were illiterate: "They were, to put it mildly, unmotivated and in over their heads." He thought of the lower-tracked students in highly stereotypical terms: ". . . young boys walking their pregnant girlfriends to school, ghetto-busters worn in class, slap fights in the hallways, and boys groping their girlfriends against metal lockers."

Throughout the course, Larry persistently questioned the purposes of literature for what he called "non-English majors," students like those he encountered in the lower-tracked

English class. In fact, he wondered if literature had any value at all for *any* student who wasn't an English major, even those students he described as "basically smart, left-hemisphere, fact-and-logic-minded kids." "Though I am a committed writer myself with an undergraduate degree in English literature and many graduate-level classes in Literature," Larry reflected, "I am no longer convinced teaching literature has value for school-age students today." In the end, Larry's ideas about the purposes of literature continued to center narrowly on literary interpretation and critical analysis. In a discussion of his own teaching at the local community college, he described his perpetual dilemma:

> Now here I am, trying to motivate them to care why a flat character differs from a round one, why a plot is different than life itself, if stories have symbols worth interpreting, and why Flannery O'Connor and Grace Paley--to name two authors we have recentiy read--even matter. Do they matter to these particular kids? Suppose they were a more typical mix of high school students--future mechanics, grocery clerks, and housewives among them. Should an auto mechanic care? Should a plumber care? I am not questioning the need to promote literacy. But I am saying that literacy can be taught in classes that prepare students for the marketplace. . . . I simply don't believe a paper characterizing Cassius in *Julius Caesar* could ever matter as much as a resume and cover letter. Not today. Not among non-English majors.

Finally, neither Larry's conceptions of literature nor his attitudes toward students changed as a result of his experiences in this course. His development as a teacher of literature was inhibited by his reluctance to participate in autobiographical inquiry as well as his negative attitudes toward students whom he considered to be illiterate and non-teachable. His successful experiences in numerous college English courses dictated a narrow conception of literature (deciding between flat and round characters, interpreting symbols, writing a character sketch, and so on) and severely limited his ideas about the purposes of literature in students' lives. He left the course believing that he could still learn techniques which would make him a better teacher, which would eliminate those "blank stares" which his students consistently gave him.

Mario: Involving Marginalized Students through Conversation and Collaboration

> *In high school, literature class was the most boring subject on my schedule. My main concern [in this course] was how I would change the curriculum to make the class more interesting and enjoyable for my students. . . . The group work process in this course has opened my eyes in seeing that group work makes the class more interesting. Sometimes students feel intimidated by the teacher because they feel that the teacher is always correct. I know this is how I felt when I was in high school. I believe that students will enjoy sharing their opinions on what they have read with other students. --Mario, a teacher candidate*

When Mario entered the course, he asked, "How do you get a student who is not interested in reading to read?" He considered himself to be the "perfect example" of someone who does not enjoy reading and believed that *many* students shared his experiences and views:

> When I was in grade school, I had more important things to worry about besides reading. I come from a poor family. At home, my brothers and sister and I had to worry about having clean clothes for the next school day, hoping there would be food for dinner, or worrying about my parents arguing when my father was home. To me these problems were more important than reading. I had to worry about everyday life, rather than what book would take my imagination away. In school, I was involved in sports. . . . Many people [in this class] wonder why I played sports instead of going to libraries. The main reason was because it kept me off the streets. It was my way out of the neighborhood.

Mario came to the university to study journalism because he wanted to be a sports writer. In high school, he excelled in wrestling, a sport which afforded his opportunities to travel across the southwest United States, and he served as sports editor of his high school newspaper. Sports, particularly wrestling, enabled Mario to "get out" of his hometown, and his success with writing, particularly his sports writing, gave him the impetus to enter the university. His mother constantly encouraged him to work hard so that he would not repeat her "mistakes": "She wanted me to do everything!" Without his mother's support, Mario felt that he would have joined a gang and dropped out of school. He believed that his coming to college was an important example for his own family and community as well as his future students: "I am proof that it can happen."

Unlike Larry, Mario willingly struggled in this course to make sense of his previous encounters with literature and gradually began to view literature and the teaching of literature in new and powerful ways. As a member of the classroom community, Mario's questions and comments challenged everyone's ideas about the purposes of literature, of teaching, and of schooling. When he entered the course, Mario did not consider himself to be a reader: "I'm like the worst reader, the worst. I do what I got to do, for my grade or whatever. But I'm like the worst reader. I get bored." His conceptions of literature prior to the course were narrowly defined by his high school English courses and the canonical works he remembered studying in those courses. Prior to the teacher education course, he did not recognize his outside-of-school reading experiences (reading sports magazines, newspapers, church-related documents, and so on) as true "reading" experiences.

Throughout his school experiences, positive encounters with literature were rare for Mario because he felt "left out": "I was always intimidated by literature class because the teacher is always right." However, as Mario reflected on his experiences, he began to realize that, while most of his school experiences with literature had been meaningless to him, a few recent experiences had been powerful. For example, when Mario entered the university to study journalism, he encountered a book which seemed to change his life. In a summer program for entering minority students, Mario read Maya Angelou's *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings*:

> I remember staying up at night to read it. It dealt with things I could relate to being a minority. For the first time, I learned there was more to literature than Beowulf and Shakespeare and reading out of a literature book. I'll read *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings* again, too. I would read it with students. Students like me can relate to it.

His encounters with books by other minority writers in the teacher education course proved to be a catalyst for his development as a teacher. "I can find myself in books like *I Know Why*

the Caged Bird Sings or *House on Mango Street* or *Bless Me, Ultima*. If you give high school students something they can relate to, it will open their minds."

Mario's participation in group discussions with his peers in this course provided an opportunity for him to recount his personal experiences and to voice his opinions. It became apparent that Mario's voice had been silenced in school settings in the past:

> I'm really enjoying this class because I get the opportunity to talk and participate. I get to share my point of view with the rest of the class. I believe that being heard is really important. A student feels as though he belongs to something. He feels comfortable talking when called upon. . . . This is the first class in a long time that I have actually talked and asked questions. When I usually go to class, I just sit there, take notes, and leave. When I leave, I feel as though I don't belong in that classroom. But in this class, I feel as though I am part of something. I look forward to coming to class. Making my students want to come to my class will be one of my goals.

Mario felt that many students from backgrounds similar to his own also feel as if they "don't belong" in literature classrooms today, and he consistently urged his classmates in the teacher education course to consider diverse perspectives on literature and literature teaching. He wrote "think pieces" on the dangers of stereotyping students in literature classrooms and on the importance of valuing students' out-of-school experiences and lives. "Good teachers," Mario believed, "teach what is required but take it a step further. The listen to their students' feedback and make changes if the curriculum is not going well."

Mario's encounters with young Hispanic males in a local high school provided him with further insights as he developed his ideas for teaching literature. As a tutor/mentor in this university program, Mario worked with students "who come from low income families and have to deal with many problems that most 'average' students do not." Unlike Larry, Mario was able to look past stereotypical labels (i.e., getting into fights, hanging out with gang members, wearing inappropriate clothing, and so on) and look toward these students' potential:

> Eric has been brought up by his father ever since his mother died. His older brother hangs out with gang members and encourages Eric to do the same. Eric says that he is always getting into fights because of his brother and his brother's friends. This is a big concern to me, because I find Eric to be someone who wants to work and is willing to learn in high school. Out of the four students whom I work with, Eric works the hardest and is always asking questions when he needs help. He does not hold back when it comes to asking questions. . . . Students feel intimidated by teachers, so they never ask questions in class. . . . So my concern is, what do we as teachers do with students who are having trouble outside of school? What can we do to keep them interested in staying in school? . . . Teachers should be willing to try new activities such as group work so that students will want to return to the class every day. Teachers should treat each member of the classroom as an individual and not a number.

As a result of his participation in this course, Mario gained confidence in himself as a reader and a future teacher of literature. "Everything that I have done in this class," he reflected, "has been helpful in developing my perspective on a response-centered curriculum for the literature classroom." He reported that he "learned to work with different people" and appreciate the opinions of others. Mario's conception of literature changed over the course of the semester, and he left the class saying that he would use relevant texts with his own students:

> I realize that my perception of the word "literature" changed since the first day of class. If I had been asked, "What does the word *literature* mean to you?' on the first day of class, I would have responded with "proper texts" such as *Hamlet* or Shakespeare or just something boring that I had read in high school. But now I realize that the meaning has changed for me. I respond now with the answer of "anything that you read. It does not matter what it is, as long as you read and get something out of it." My perception did change from the first day of class.

Finally, this course and its structured set of experiences offered Mario a chance to develop his own voice as a future teacher. "I feel good about myself," Mario wrote, "and now have a confidence that I did not have before I took this class." Mario's development as a teacher of literature was fostered by his reflective autobiographical inquiry which led him to relive his encounters with literature and literacy in a variety of settings, his ongoing experiences as a

mentor/tutor for Hispanic males from a local high school, and his discovery and discussion of literature by minority writers.

Implications for Teacher Educators

The stories of Larry and Mario offer teacher educators an opportunity to reflect upon the effectiveness of professional education coursework and their work as teacher educators. In particular, the following suggestions may help teacher educators rethink their own instructional roles, especially if they allow belief exploration and challenge to guide their curricula and practice.

First, *teacher educators must become models of the kind of teaching they encourage.* In this teacher education course, future teachers of literature were afforded opportunities for intimate involvement and engagement with literary texts. Instead of a familiar teacher-centered approach to instruction, teacher candidates were immersed in an atmosphere which invited student response to literature through written responses to texts and small-group and whole-class discussion. In addition, preservice teachers reflected upon and investigated their own and others' reading processes and histories. Through these experiences, many teacher candidates began to rethink their mental stereotypes of literature and literature teaching and began to envision the literature classroom as a community of readers and writers. Even though Larry remained uncomfortable with the social negotiation of meaning in literature discussion, the community atmosphere in the "Teaching of Literature" classroom had a profound impact upon Mario and many of the teacher candidates in the course. As one student said, "Through actually feeling what it is like to be in a response-centered classroom, I am beginning to be able to see myself as a literature teacher." The majority of the teacher candidates in this course reported that the course offered them a concrete model. "All of a sudden, I *get* it," wrote one student. "The idea of a response-centered classroom, the

philosophy of being a "guide" rather than a "teacher"--it feels right." And toward the end of the semester, another student realized,

> Our class has been a perfect example of a group of "traditional" students trying to be nudged toward being a response-centered community. We had our skeptics who taught us a great deal, and our enthusiasts, and then we also had those who drifted in and out of both categories. This was a great lesson in itself because we now know what some of the reactions to a response-centered classroom might be.

Second, *teacher educators must "provide opportunities for prospective teachers to identify and examine the beliefs that they have about the content they teach"* (Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989, p. 32), for conceptions or beliefs about content influence both *what* teachers teach and *how* they teach it (Grossman, 1990). Fox (1993b) has suggested that beginning teachers in secondary English "live" on the borders between competing conceptions of literature: the conception present in the university English department's literature courses, the conception present in education courses, the conception present in classrooms they observe or in which they teach. This uneasiness creates internal conflict for novices, especially when they have not had opportunities to articulate their own beliefs. Throughout this course, preservice teachers were asked to reflect upon their conceptions of literature: What is literature? Why are we studying literature in the first place? Why bother reading stories, poems, and plays? Why do we require students to read literature in secondary schools? These questions proved to be frustrating for Larry who simply wanted to learn "techniques" for teaching, but many students, including Mario, gained new insights into their sense of themselves as learners and their visions of themselves as literature teachers through the recursive processes of inquiry and reflection. One student described this process as a kind of *awakening*, a time when she could "voice" her beliefs and see the connections and patterns in her own thinking, connections between her own experiences as a learner in the course and her ideas about good

teaching in literature classrooms. "Now I feel a lot more stable and secure with my beliefs," she concluded, "and most of all *organized* with my beliefs."

Finally, *teacher educators should realize that their "good intentions do not guarantee results" (Pajares, 1993, p. 49).* As Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985) suggest, "the pull of prior beliefs" about the "familiar worlds of teaching and learning" is strong for prospective teachers (p. 29). In fact, Larry's experiences in the teacher education course might be characterized as a sort of endless "tug-of-war," a pushing and pulling between 1) his preconceptions of literature as a body of knowledge and his beliefs concerning literature teaching as the imparting of that knowledge and 2) his encounters with a response-centered literature curriculum and his introduction to a new image of the literature teacher as a responder and guide. Despite the fact that Larry responded only occasionally to instructional approaches and strategies offered in the course and even though his written reflections and actions revealed an insensitivity to diverse learners, he did acknowledge that he had been "provoked" and "forced into self-questioning and self-defining." Perhaps Pajares' advice is warranted here: "Teacher educators should challenge beliefs not simply to search and destroy but to encourage self-exploration, clarity, consistency, and commitment" (p. 47). True, we should not set "theoretical indoctrination" (Pajares, 1993) as our primary purpose in teacher education; nevertheless, we should continue to challenge preservice teachers to reconsider any beliefs which may hinder their effectiveness in the classroom or harm their students in any way. Furthermore, we must not ask our students "to examine their educational beliefs within a vacuum" (Pajares, p. 51), but we must continue to ask our students to consider their beliefs about education within the larger context of culture and society (Greene, 1986).

Note: I wish to thank Rena Leith, Elizabeth Noll, and Gail Pritchard for their assistance in data collection and preliminary analysis. This research was funded by the University of Arizona Foundation and the Vice President for Research at the University of Arizona. Project Title: *Constructing a Case Literature for Teacher Education: Exploring and Enhancing Teacher Knowledge in Secondary English.*

References

Anaya, R. (1972). *Bless me, Ultima.* Berkeley, CA: Tonatiuh Quinto Sol International Publishers.

Bird, T.; Anderson, L.M.; Sullivan, B.A.; & Swidler, S.A. (1993). Pedagogical balancing acts: Attempts to influence prospective teachers' beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 9,* 253-267.

Britzman, D.P. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 56,* 442-456.

Calderhead, J. (1991). The nature and growth of knowledge in student teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7,* 531-535.

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Cisneros, S. (1989). *House on mango street.* New York: Vintage Books.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching,* 3rd edition (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchmann, M. (1985). The first year of teacher preparation: Transition to pedagogical thinking? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. ERIC ED 256 753.

Fox, D.L. (1991a). *From English major to English teacher: Case studies of student teachers and their first year of teaching English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri--Columbia.

Fox, D.L. (1991b). Building a reading community: "Intertextuality" and the adult reader. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 18* (3), 176-185.

Fox, D.L. (1993a). *Constructing a case literature for teacher education: Exploring and enhancing teacher knowledge in secondary English.* Project funded by the University of Arizona Foundation and the Vice President for Research, University of Arizona.

Fox, D.L. (1993b). The influence of context, community and culture: Contrasting cases in teacher knowledge development. In D.J. Leu & C.K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Examining central issues in literacy research, theory, and practice* (pp. 345-351). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory.* New York: Aldine.

Greene, M. (1986). Philosophy and teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching, 3rd edition* (pp. 479-504). New York: Macmillan.

Grossman, P.L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Grossman, P.L. (1991). Overcoming the apprenticeship of observation in teacher education coursework. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7* (4), 345-357.

Grossman, P.L. (1992). Why models matter: An alternate view on professional growth. *Review of Educational Research, 62* (2), 171-179.

Grossman, P.L.; Wilson, S.; & Shulman, L.S. (1989). Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching. In M. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher.* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Hurston, Z.N. (1990). *Their eyes were watching God.* New York: Harper & Row.

Kutz, E. (1992). Preservice teachers as researchers: Developing practice and creating theory in the English classroom. *English Education, 24* (2), 67-75.

Kutz, E. & Roskelly, H. (1991). *An unquiet pedagogy: Transforming practice in the English classroom.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Lee, H. (1960). *To kill a mockingbird.* New York: Warner.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nelms, B.F. (Ed.) (1988). *Literature in the classroom: Readers, texts, and contexts.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Nespor, J.K. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19* (4), 317-28.

Pajares, F. (1993). Preservice teachers' beliefs: A focus for teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 15* (2), 45-54.

Purves, A. et al. (1990). *How porcupines make love II: Teaching a response-centered literature curriculum.* New York: Longman.

Richardson, V.; Anders, P.; Tidwell, D. & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. *American Educational Research Journal, 28* (3), 559-586.

Rosenblatt, L. (1983). *Literature as exploration.* 4th ed. New York: Modern Language Association.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Scholes, R. (1987). Textuality: Power and pleasure. *English Education, 20,* pp. 69-81.

Seidman, I.E. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Spradley, J.P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Taylor, M. (1976). *Roll of thunder, hear my cry.* New York: Penguin.

Wilson, S.M. (1990). The secret garden of teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71,* 204-209.

Yin, R.K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Zancanella, D. (1991). Teachers reading/readers teaching: Five teachers' personal approaches to literature and their teaching of literature. *Research in the Teaching of English, 25* (1), 5-32.